

REMARKS

1. The drawings were objected to as not of sufficient quality to permit examination. Replacement drawings, FIG. 1-6, were sent to the Office on August 16, 2005.

2. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jordan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,313,035). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is noted, the rationale provided by the Examiner for the present claim rejection corresponds verbatim to the rationale provided December 1, 2003 in the parent Application Serial No. 09/728,211 filed on December 1, 2000. The present case is a continuation of the parent Application. Applicant filed a preliminary amendment and remarks concurrently with the filing of the present application on April 14, 2004, but those amendments and remarks were not addressed in the present Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests that all remarks be fully considered and addressed by the Examiner.

Generally, applicant's claimed invention is directed to a system (claim 1) and method (claim 18) for providing a remote caller profile service, whereby caller profile information relating to a subscriber may be delivered to a called party terminal for a call executed by the subscriber from a remote terminal. In such manner, caller profile information such as caller ID information associated with the subscriber's "home phone" may be delivered to a called party terminal (i.e., the terminal that is called by the caller profile subscriber), even though the subscriber is calling from a remote terminal. It is important to recognize that the term "caller profile" refers to the profile of the **calling party** – and hence "caller profile subscriber" is a calling party subscriber making an **outgoing** call to a called party. The remote terminal is a terminal other than the one to which the caller subscribes (i.e., other than the subscriber's "home phone") **from** which the calling party subscriber is making an outgoing call. The "called party terminal" is the terminal operated by a **called party** that receives an **incoming call** from the calling party subscriber. The "caller profile information" is information associated with the **calling party** subscriber that is communicated to the called party via the incoming call.

The Jordan patent describes a method of providing person locator service for **called party** subscribers, whereby a calling party may reach a called party subscriber wherever the subscriber may be located. Responsive to a caller keying in a particular code unique to the subscriber, the network consults a database to determine the availability of the called party subscriber to receive the call. If the called party subscriber is unavailable, the network may play an announcement indicating that the subscriber is in transit or unavailable. If the called party subscriber is available, the network may automatically complete the call to the subscriber. It is noted, Jordan discloses various enhancements for use in conjunction with the person locator service. As one example, the called party subscriber may record a personal message to be played to person locator callers. As another example, a call completion number may be provided to certain person locator callers. Respectfully, none of the various enhancements described in the Jordan patent relate to a **caller** profile as claimed (i.e., referring to a profile of a calling party) but rather relate to a **called party** profile. To the extent Jordan describes a remote terminal (e.g., station 12), this is a terminal at which a called party subscriber may receive an **incoming** call. Applicant recognizes that a subscriber could make an outgoing call from station 12 to a called party, but Jordan neither teaches nor suggests that such outgoing call from a remote terminal would communicate caller profile information associated with the calling party subscriber to the called party.

The Office Action suggests that the subscriber “A” described in the Jordan patent may be considered a “caller profile subscriber” and that the database and ‘list’ stored for subscriber A includes “caller profile information.” However, subscriber A is a prospective **called party** that subscribes to a person locator service. The database and ‘list’ stored for subscriber A relates to information that may be played to a calling party attempting to reach subscriber A. Hence, to the extent the database and list may be considered to include “profile” information, it refers to the profile of the subscriber as a called party, not as a calling party. There is no suggestion that the information in the database would be played coincident to an outgoing call from the subscriber to a called party, not to mention an outgoing call from the subscriber using a remote terminal.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 18 distinguish over Jordan for at least the reason that they are directed to providing caller profile information associated with a caller profile subscriber, for

3. In view of the above amendments and remarks, entry of the amendments and a notice of allowance of claims 1, 7, 8 and 18-20 is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Steven R. Santema

Steven R. Santema

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 40,156

Phone: (630) 979-7006

Date: Oct. 17, 2005

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030